

**OPINION 2016 (Case 2888)*****Valdivianemertes* Stiasny-Wijnhoff, 1923 (Nemertea): not conserved**

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that priority should be maintained for the nemertean generic name *Akrostomum* Grube, 1840. A proposal had been made to conserve the junior objective synonym *Valdivianemertes* Stiasny-Wijnhoff, 1923.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Nemertea; CRATENEMERTIDAE; *Akrostomum*; *Valdivianemertes*; *Akrostomum stannii*.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) Proposals put forward for the conservation of the generic name *Valdivianemertes* Stiasny-Wijnhoff, 1923 were not approved.
- (2) The name *Akrostomum* Grube, 1840 (gender: neuter), type species by monotypy *Akrostomum stannii* Grube, 1840, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
- (3) The name *stannii* Grube, 1840, as published in the binomen *Akrostomum stannii* (specific name of the type species of *Akrostomum* Grube, 1840), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:
  - (a) *Valdivianemertes* Stiasny-Wijnhoff, 1923 (a junior objective synonym of *Akrostomum* Grube, 1840);
  - (b) *Acrostomum* Örsted, 1843 (an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Akrostomum* Grube, 1840).

**History of Case 2888**

An application for the conservation of the generic name *Valdivianemertes* Stiasny-Wijnhoff, 1923, which was threatened by the senior objective synonym *Akrostomum* Grube, 1840, was received from Frank B. Crandall (*Turkey Run Research Institute, McLean, Virginia, U.S.A.*) on 21 April 1993. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 51: 298–301 (December 1994). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals. No comments on this case were received.

The application was sent to the Commission for voting on 1 December 1995. The case received a majority of the votes cast but failed to reach the required two-thirds majority (17 votes in favour and 9 against). Voting against the application on 1 December 1995 Bouchet commented: 'the application cites five authors who have used *Valdivianemertes* since 1923; the present voting paper adds two. This points to a very limited usage of that name. Priority should apply'. As a result, the application was submitted for a second vote on 1 September 2002 under Bylaw 35.

No other comments were received in relation to this case before the second vote, even though the Commission Secretariat invited the author to provide additional support for the application.

### Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 2002 the members of the Commission were invited to revote on the proposals published in BZN 51: 299.

At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2002 the votes were as follows: 14 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 10 Commissioners voted AGAINST, no votes were received from Böhme, Dupuis and Martins de Souza, Ng was on leave of absence.

Voting against Brothers commented: 'The fact that no further comments have been received reinforces the impression that strict adherence to priority would not cause major confusion in this case'.

### Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

- Acrostomum* Örsted, 1843, *Naturhistorisk Tidsskrift* (Udgivet af H. Kroyer) Ræk. 1, 1837–1843, Bd. 4, p. 95.  
*Akrostomum* Grube, 1840, *Actinien, Echinodermen und Würmer des Adriatischen- und Mittelmeers*, p. 57.  
*stannii, Akrostomum*, Grube, 1840, *Actinien, Echinodermen und Würmer des Adriatischen- und Mittelmeers*, p. 57.  
*Valdivianemertes* Stiasny-Wijnhoff, 1923, *Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science*, 67: 643.